



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,115	12/09/2003	Joseph S. Nadan	N0050.0000/P001	4330
24998	7590	11/27/2009	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP 1825 EYE STREET NW Washington, DC 20006-5403				ERB, NATHAN
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/27/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/730,115	NADAN, JOSEPH S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NATHAN ERB	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's response to Office action was received on July 24, 2009.
2. In response to Applicant's amendment of the claims, all of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, from the previous Office action are hereby withdrawn.
3. The claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 from the previous Office action remain. While Examiner believes Applicant came closer to overcoming these rejections by adding the positive recitation of the computer to the comparing step of claim 21, Examiner believes that the text --, by said computer,-- should be inserted immediately after the word "identifying" in the last line of claim 21 to solidify that both of the "core" "solution" steps of Applicant's method are performed by a computer to attempt to fully overcome these rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101.
4. Please note the new rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, below in this Office action.
5. In response to Applicant's amendment of the claims, the corresponding prior art claim rejections have been correspondingly amended below in this Office action.
6. Regarding the prior art arguments, Applicant first argues that Nakagawa does not have the retrieval means and delivery means of claim 1. Examiner disagrees. While Nakagawa is directed more broadly to overall shipping, as opposed to drayage (which was the reason for the combination with Applicant's prior art admission in the

rejections), Nakagawa does indeed retrieve and deliver the optimal vehicles for the requested shipping orders.

7. Applicant argues that Nakagawa does not disclose the ability to search for a particular resource upon request of a participant in the shipping community. Examiner responds that Nakagawa allows a shipping order to be submitted, to which the system responds with an optimal vehicle for the order. This is in line with the language of the limitation for which Nakagawa was cited.

8. Applicant further argues that Nakagawa forces the community participant to accept the optimal solution to the query. However, note that the language of claim 1, for example, explicitly states that the returned list of resources may only be a single resource. Therefore, a single returned resource falls within the scope of Applicant's claims.

9. Applicant further argues that Nakagawa does not allow individualized shipper rates. However, note that the storing of shipper rates is not required in the independent claims; it only appears as a possibility on a list from which only one option is required.

10. Applicant argues that its system allows a carrier to refuse a shipping order, but this limitation does not appear to be present in the independent claims being argued.

11. With respect to claim 21, Applicant argues that Nakagawa does not disclose the submission of queries from the shipping community. Examiner disagrees. The queries in Nakagawa are the shipping orders, which ultimately come from the carrier customers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 3628

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

13. Claims 1-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

These claims are rejected due to Examiner being unable to find support in the application as originally filed for the following text in the amended claims:

a. "high traffic" in the second line of claim 1; that is, Examiner could not find any mention in Applicant's application as originally filed that the terminals are high-traffic or busy; note that "congestion" does not necessarily imply "busy"

b. "shipper rates" in the eleventh line of claim 1, and the tenth line of claim 20; Examiner could not find "shipper rates," that is, rates for shipping goods, in the application as originally filed; rather, the rates discussed seemed focused on equipment rental rates; even if equipment rental rates are considered to be a form of "shipper rate," note that "shipper rate" would still be a broader term than "equipment rental rate"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

14. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

15. Claims 21-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 21-35 are directed to a series of steps.

In order for a series of steps to be considered a proper process under § 101, a claimed process must either: (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials).

Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972). Thus, to qualify as patent eligible, these processes should positively recite the other statutory class to which they are tied (e.g., by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps), or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed (e.g., by identifying the product or material that is changed to a different state). Claims 21-35 identify neither the apparatus performing the recited steps nor any transformation of underlying materials, and accordingly are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 1, 3-15, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,374,178 B2, in view of Applicant's prior art admission in further view of Spasovic, Lazar Nikola, Planning Intermodal Drayage Network Operations, University of Pennsylvania, 1990.

As per **Claim 1**, Nakagawa et al. discloses:

- a system for administering a collaborative shipping community (column 3, lines 29-63; column 14, lines 8-17);
 - a processor (Figure 3; column 10, lines 29-37; column 12, line 64, through column 13, line 16);
 - memory operationally attached to said processor (Figure 3; column 9, lines 6-15; column 10, lines 29-37; column 12, line 64, through column 13, line 16);
 - an input device operationally attached to said processor (Figure 3; column 7, lines 11-22; column 8, lines 43-53; column 10, lines 29-37; column 12, line 64, through column 13, line 16; column 14, lines 8-17);
 - storing means for storing: a plurality of shipping resource data fields, and shipping resource data associated with at least one shipping resource, said shipping resource data corresponding to at least one of said plurality of shipping resource data fields, including pick-up locations (column 14, lines 18-54);
 - receiving means for receiving query data, said query data associated with at least one shipping need, and said query data corresponding to at least one of said plurality of shipping resource data fields (column 3, lines 48-63; column 4, lines 31-52; column 5, lines 9-25; column 14, lines 18-54);
 - retrieval means for retrieving, based on a match between said query data and said shipping resource data, a list of at least one shipping resource (column 3, lines 48-63; column 4, lines 31-52; column 5, lines 9-25; column 14, lines 18-54);

- delivery means for delivering said list of at least one shipping resource and said shipping resource data associated with each of said shipping resources (column 7, lines 23-36; column 13, line 66, through column 14, line 2).

Nakagawa et al. fails to disclose wherein the type of shipping is drayage shipping. Applicant's prior art admission discloses wherein the type of shipping is drayage shipping (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0003]-[0004]). Therefore, the prior art included each element claimed although not necessarily in a single reference. One of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods (this is simply applying the transportation system of Nakagawa et al. specifically to drayage services). In combination, each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately (Nakagawa et al.'s limitations would still be coordinating shipping services among multiple system participants to improve efficiency; Applicant's prior art admission's limitation would still be providing the land transport portions of intermodal transportation routes). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable (the limitations do not interfere with the proper use of the other limitations in the combination; there are no surprise effects from the combination). Thus, the combination would have been obvious.

Nakagawa fails to disclose maximizing reciprocal loads, minimizing bobtailing, and reducing congestion at terminals. Spasovic discloses maximizing reciprocal loads, minimizing bobtailing, and reducing congestion at terminals (pp. 36-40, 46, 56, 136, 139-140). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the

invention of Nakagawa such that it maximizes reciprocal loads, minimizes bobtailing, and reduces congestion at terminals, as disclosed by Spasovic, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Nakagawa fails to disclose wherein the terminals are high traffic. However, Examiner hereby takes Official Notice that that element/limitation was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention (busy terminals existed). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Nakagawa such that the terminals are high traffic, as disclosed by Official Notice, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **Claim 3**, Nakagawa et al. fails to disclose wherein said drayage resource is a power unit. Applicant's prior art admission further discloses wherein said drayage resource is a power unit (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0003]-[0004], paragraph [0006]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified in the rejection for claim 1 such that said drayage resource is a power unit, as disclosed by

Applicant's prior art admission. Motivation is provided by Applicant's prior art admission in that power units are used to perform drayage services (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0003]-[0004], paragraph [0006]).

As per **Claim 4**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said shipping resource is a load (column 14, lines 18-54).

As per **Claim 5**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said shipping resource is a storage space (column 14, lines 18-54; garage information).

As per **Claim 6**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said shipping resource is a service (column 11, lines 28-34; column 14, lines 8-17; carriers' business activity data represents their shipping services).

As per **Claim 7**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said plurality of shipping resource data fields comprises a controlling entity (column 14, lines 8-17; column 14, lines 18-54; carrier data, for example).

As per **Claims 8-9**, Nakagawa et al. fails to disclose wherein said controlling entity is an owner and wherein said controlling entity is a lessor. Applicant's prior art admission further discloses wherein said controlling entity is an owner and wherein said controlling entity is a lessor (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0003]-[0004]). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified in the rejection for claim 2 such that said controlling entity is an owner and such that said controlling entity is a lessor, as disclosed by Applicant's prior art admission. Motivation is provided by Applicant's prior art admission in that drayage operators may own or lease their equipment.

As per **Claim 10**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said plurality of shipping resource data fields comprises a resource type field (column 14, lines 18-54; system distinguishes between various types of resources).

As per **Claim 11**, Nakagawa et al. and Applicant's prior art admission fail to disclose wherein said plurality of resource data fields comprises a serial number field. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that this element/limitation was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention (it was common to identify and track equipment via serial numbers in databases, with regard to various applications). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified in the rejection for claim 1 such that said plurality of resource data fields comprises a serial number field, as was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. Motivation is provided in that Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that

a unique serial number allows for each individual piece of equipment in a system to be specifically identified relative to every other piece of equipment in the system (this follows from each serial number being unique).

As per **Claim 12**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said plurality of shipping resource data fields comprises a physical location field (column 10, lines 17-28; column 14, lines 18-54).

As per **Claim 13**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said plurality of shipping resource data fields comprises physical description field (Figure 8; column 14, lines 18-54; e.g., “vehicle type”).

As per **Claim 14**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said plurality of shipping resource data fields comprises a time available field (column 7, lines 23-36; column 8, lines 5-31).

As per **Claim 15**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said plurality of shipping resource data fields comprises an acquisition fee field (column 5, lines 9-24; column 10, lines 14-16; column 13, lines 39-47; column 14, lines 8-17).

As per **Claim 17**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses reserving means for reserving a shipping resource (column 5, lines 1-5; column 5, lines 9-25; column 7, lines

11-22; column 13, lines 29-35). Nakagawa et al. and Applicant's prior art admission fail to disclose confirming means for confirming the reservation. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that this limitation was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention (confirmation of online reservations was typical). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified in the rejection for claim 1 such that it includes confirming means for confirming the reservation, as was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. Motivation is provided in that Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that the purpose of confirming a reservation is to verify that the reservation was indeed completed.

As per Claim 19, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said delivery means delivers exactly one shipping resource having resource data that best match said query data according to a predetermined matching algorithm (column 3, lines 48-63; column 4, lines 31-52; column 5, lines 9-25; column 14, lines 18-54).

18. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al. in view of Applicant's prior art admission in further view of Spasovic in further view of Carson, U.S. Patent No. 6,577,921 B1.

As per Claim 2, Nakagawa et al. and Applicants' prior art admission fail to disclose wherein said shipping resource being tracked is a container. Carson discloses

wherein said shipping resource being tracked is a container (column 1, line 66, through column 2, line 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified in the rejection for claim 1 such that said shipping resource being tracked is a container, as disclosed by Carson. Motivation is provided by Carson in that tracking shipping containers helps to avoid losing them (column 1, line 66, through column 2, line 24).

19. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al. in view of Applicant's prior art admission in further view of Spasovic in further view of Taylor, John C., and Jackson, George C., "Conflict, Power, and Evolution in the Intermodal Transportation Industry's Channel of Distribution," Transportation Journal, Spring 2000, pp. 5-17.

As per Claim 18, Nakagawa et al. further discloses an agreement proposal means (column 5, lines 1-5; column 5, lines 9-25; column 7, lines 11-22; column 13, lines 29-35; means for setting up order, which is an agreement). Nakagawa et al. and Applicant's prior art admission fail to disclose proposing an interchange agreement. Taylor et al. discloses proposing an interchange agreement (p. 13, column 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified in the rejection for claim 17 such that it proposes an interchange agreement, as disclosed by Taylor et al. Motivation is provided by Taylor et al. in that interchange agreements allow for the more effective use of equipment (p. 13, column 2).

20. Claims 20-23, 25-30, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa in view of Applicant's prior art admission.

As per **Claim 20**, Nakagawa et al. discloses:

- a system for administering a collaborative shipping community (column 3, lines 29-63; column 14, lines 8-17);
- a processor (Figure 3; column 10, lines 29-37; column 12, line 64, through column 13, line 16);
 - memory operationally attached to said processor (Figure 3; column 9, lines 6-15; column 10, lines 29-37; column 12, line 64, through column 13, line 16);
 - an input device operationally attached to said processor (Figure 3; column 7, lines 11-22; column 8, lines 43-53; column 10, lines 29-37; column 12, line 64, through column 13, line 16; column 14, lines 8-17);
 - a storage device for storing: a plurality of shipping resource data fields, and shipping resource data associated with at least one shipping resource, said shipping resource data corresponding to at least one of said plurality of shipping resource data fields, including pick-up locations (column 14, lines 18-54);
 - a receiving unit for receiving query data, said query data associated with at least one shipping need, and said query data corresponding to at least one of said plurality of shipping resource data fields (column 3, lines 48-63; column 4, lines 31-52; column 5, lines 9-25; column 14, lines 18-54);

- a retrieval unit for retrieving, based on a match between said query data and said shipping resource data, a list of at least one shipping resource (column 3, lines 48-63; column 4, lines 31-52; column 5, lines 9-25; column 14, lines 18-54);

- a delivery unit for delivering said list of at least one shipping resource and said shipping resource data associated with each of said shipping resources (column 7, lines 23-36; column 13, line 66, through column 14, line 2).

Nakagawa et al. fails to disclose wherein the type of shipping is drayage shipping. Applicant's prior art admission discloses wherein the type of shipping is drayage shipping (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0003]-[0004]). Therefore, the prior art included each element claimed although not necessarily in a single reference. One of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods (this is simply applying the transportation system of Nakagawa et al. specifically to drayage services). In combination, each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately (Nakagawa et al.'s limitations would still be coordinating shipping services among multiple system participants to improve efficiency; Applicant's prior art admission's limitation would still be providing the land transport portions of intermodal transportation routes). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable (the limitations do not interfere with the proper use of the other limitations in the combination; there are no surprise effects from the combination). Thus, the combination would have been obvious.

As per **Claim 21**, Nakagawa et al. discloses:

- a method for administering a collaborative shipping community (column 3, lines 29-63; column 14, lines 8-17);
 - using a computer for processing a readable medium, said medium having executable instructions (column 10, lines 17-28);
 - obtaining data about shipping community participants regarding said participants' shipping resources (column 14, lines 18-54);
 - causing said data to be stored in said computer (column 14, lines 18-54);
 - gathering query data (column 3, lines 48-63; column 4, lines 31-52; column 5, lines 9-25; column 14, lines 18-54);
 - comparing in said computer said query data against said shipping resource data (column 3, lines 48-63; column 4, lines 31-52; column 5, lines 9-25; column 14, lines 18-54);
 - identifying said shipping resources having resource data that match said query data (column 3, lines 48-63; column 4, lines 31-52; column 5, lines 9-25; column 14, lines 18-54).

Nakagawa et al. fails to disclose wherein the type of shipping is drayage shipping. Applicant's prior art admission discloses wherein the type of shipping is drayage shipping (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0003]-[0004]). Therefore, the prior art included each element claimed although not necessarily in a single reference. One of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods (this is simply applying the transportation system of Nakagawa et al.

Art Unit: 3628

specifically to drayage services). In combination, each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately (Nakagawa et al.'s limitations would still be coordinating shipping services among multiple system participants to improve efficiency; Applicant's prior art admission's limitation would still be providing the land transport portions of intermodal transportation routes). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable (the limitations do not interfere with the proper use of the other limitations in the combination; there are no surprise effects from the combination). Thus, the combination would have been obvious.

Nakagawa et al. and Applicant's prior art admission fail to disclose wherein data about shipping community participants is gathered directly from them. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that one of the quickest ways to obtain information about an organization is typically to contact the organization directly (this is done frequently in the business world). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified above in this rejection such that information about an organization is gathered directly from them, as was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. Motivation is provided in that Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that organizations are frequently willing to share information about themselves with the outside world for conducting business.

As per **Claim 22**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses reserving at least one of said shipping resources having resource data that match said query data (column 5, lines 1-5; column 5, lines 9-25; column 7, lines 11-22; column 13, lines 29-35).

As per **Claim 23**, Nakagawa et al. and Applicant's prior art admission fail to disclose confirming a reservation for a resource. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that this limitation was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention (confirmation of online reservations was typical). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified in the rejection for claim 21 such that it confirms a reservation for a resource, as was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. Motivation is provided in that Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that the purpose of confirming a reservation is to verify that the reservation was indeed completed.

As per **Claim 25**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said step of identifying said shipping resources having resource data that match said query data is accomplished according to a predetermined matching algorithm (column 3, lines 48-63; column 4, lines 31-52; column 5, lines 9-25; column 14, lines 18-54).

As per **Claims 26-30**, Nakagawa et al. fails to disclose wherein said drayage community participants include drayage operators, drayage brokers, owner-operators, intermodal marketing companies, and line-haul operators. Applicant's prior art admission further discloses wherein said drayage community participants include drayage operators, drayage brokers, owner-operators, intermodal marketing companies, and line-haul operators (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0004] and [0008]). Therefore, the prior art included each element claimed although not necessarily in a single reference. One of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods (this is just a further adaptation of Nakagawa et al. to incorporate several specific types of drayage service providers into its system). In combination, each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately (Nakagawa et al.'s limitations would still be coordinating shipping services among multiple system participants to improve efficiency; Applicant's prior art admission's limitations would still be providing the land transport portions of intermodal transportation routes and providing several types of drayage community services; the Officially Noticed limitation would still be providing a function of allowing needed data to be obtained). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable (the limitations do not interfere with the proper use of the other limitations in the combination; there are no surprise effects from the combination). Thus, the combination would have been obvious.

As per **Claim 32**, Nakagawa et al. fails to disclose wherein said drayage resources include power units. Applicant's prior art admission further discloses wherein said drayage resources include power units (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0003]-[0004], paragraph [0006]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified in the rejection for claim 21 such that said drayage resources include power units, as disclosed by Applicant's prior art admission. Motivation is provided by Applicant's prior art admission in that power units are used to perform drayage services (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0003]-[0004], paragraph [0006]).

As per **Claim 33**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said shipping resources include loads (column 14, lines 18-54).

As per **Claim 34**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said shipping resources include storage spaces (column 14, lines 18-54; garage information).

As per **Claim 35**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses wherein said shipping resources include services (column 11, lines 28-34; column 14, lines 8-17; carriers' business activity data represents their shipping services).

21. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa in view of Applicant's prior art admission in further view of Taylor.

As per **Claim 24**, Nakagawa et al. further discloses an agreement proposal means (column 5, lines 1-5; column 5, lines 9-25; column 7, lines 11-22; column 13, lines 29-35; means for setting up order, which is an agreement). Nakagawa et al. and Applicant's prior art admission fail to disclose executing an interchange agreement. Taylor et al. discloses executing an interchange agreement (p. 13, column 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified in the rejection for claim 21 such that it executes an interchange agreement, as disclosed by Taylor et al. Motivation is provided by Taylor et al. in that interchange agreements allow for the more effective use of equipment (p. 13, column 2).

22. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa in view of Applicant's prior art admission in further view of Carson.

As per **Claim 31**, Nakagawa et al. and Applicants' prior art admission fail to disclose wherein said shipping resource being tracked is a container. Carson discloses wherein said shipping resource being tracked is a container (column 1, line 66, through column 2, line 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the invention of Nakagawa et al. as modified in the rejection for claim 21 such that said shipping resource being tracked is a container, as disclosed by Carson. Motivation is provided by Carson in that tracking shipping containers helps to avoid losing them (column 1, line 66, through column 2, line 24).

Conclusion

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NATHAN ERB whose telephone number is (571) 272-7606. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on (571) 272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NATHAN ERB
Examiner
Art Unit 3628

nhe

/JOHN W HAYES/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628